DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 737 CS 006 770

AUTHOR Syropoulos, M.
TITLE Evaluation of the Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center.
INSTITUTION Detroit Public Schools, Mich. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 81
NOTE 87p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Inservice Teacher Education; Learning Laboratories; Mathematics Instruction; *Private Schools; Program Content; *Program Evaluation; Reading Improvement; *Reading Programs; *Remedial Programs; *Remedial Reading
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of the Learning Resource Center, a Title I diagnostic/prescriptive learning program designed to provide help for students with extreme learning difficulties in 26 nonpublic schools, is discussed in this paper. The first part of the paper is a synopsis of the program evaluation, including a summary of findings and subsequent recommendations, while the major portion of the paper describes the project and evaluation in more detail. Following the synopsis, the first section discusses the rationale, functions, and responsibilities of the Learning Resource Center. The next section describes the evaluation design, which consisted of pretest and posttest administration of the California Achievement Test and Stanford Diagnostic Test; questionnaires administered to participating teachers, parents, and center staff; and a questionnaire to assess the inservice training of the Center teachers. The third section provides an evaluation and analysis of the data, which indicated from 5 to 14 months' gain for each grade level through grade eight, and a positive response from parents, school staff, and center teachers. The fourth section provides evaluation of seven learning objectives pursued by the center, as indicated by the results of the two achievement tests. Appendixes contain the questionnaires administered to teachers, staff, and parents. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219737

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EVALUATION

OF

THE NEW PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER

Funded Under

Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I

Prepared by

Dr. M. Syropoulos, Project Evaluator
Office of Research, Planning and Evaluation
Department of Research and Evaluation

September 1981

CS206770

ABSTRACT

Title	:	Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center
Funding Source	:	ESEA, Title I
Funding Level	:	$1,271,000.00
Purpose	:	To establish and maintain a diagnostic/prescriptive learning program to recognize and provide for students with extreme learning difficulties.
Eligibility Requirements	:	Title I children in grades 1 through 12 in twenty-seven non-public schools in Detroit.
Number of Students Served	:	Approximately 1,453
Location	:	Twenty-seven Non-Public schools in Detroit, Michigan
Number of Professionals	:	Thirty-five
Evaluation	:	The Office of Research, Planning and Evaluation, Research and Evaluation Department, Detroit Public Schools
First Year of Funding	:	1971-72
Program Features	:	The staff provides diagnostic/prescriptive treatment for Title I students referred to them by the teachers and/or the school administration. The students are diagnosed and properly treated individually or in small groups in their own schools. Perceptual training materials, individualized reading and math materials, and staff developed materials are used to meet the needs of each student.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SYNOPSIS OF THE EVALUATION i

Brief Description of the Project. i
Evaluation Design ii
Summary of Findings iii
Recommendations vii
Conclusion. viii

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT. 1

Rationale 1
Functions and Responsibilities. 2
Operation of the Project. 2
Monitoring and Documentation. 3

II. EVALUATION DESIGN AND RESULTS 4

III. EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA 4

IV. PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE EVALUATION. 7

Product Objective #1. 7
Product Objective #2. 11
Product Objective #3. 16
Product Objective #4. 20

Process Objective #1. 24
Process Objective #2. 33
Process Objective #3. 39

APPENDICES 43

A. Staff Perceptions of the Learning Center. 44
B. Learning Center's Teachers' Perception of the Learning Center. 48
C. Parents' Perceptions of the Learning Center 51
D. In-Service Training Evaluation Instrument 55

A Synopsis
of
THE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTERS

Brief Description of Project

The Learning Resource Center was established as a method of resolving the problem of working with Title I students who are underachieving in the area of reading and mathematics. These students' learning difficulties and consequent lack of achievement have not been remediated in the normal reading or mathematics laboratory situation.

Approximately fourteen hundred and fifty-three students fit into this category and it is expected they will benefit from center treatment. A concerted effort was made by the Learning Center not only in diagnosing learning problems for target students, but in prescribing those methods which facilitate or improve the acquistion of skills which will ultimately lead to raising their academic levels of achievement in reading and mathematics.

The Learning Resource Center is a diagnostic/prescriptive learning program designed to recognize and provide for students with extreme learning difficulties in twenty-six Non-Public Schools. The staff consists of three administrators, thirty-four professionals and fifty-one school service assistants.

The staff provides diagnostic/prescriptive treatment for students referred to them. The students are treated individually or in small groups in their own schools. Perceptual training materials, individualized reading and mathematics materials, and staff developed materials are uased to meet the needs of each student.

Evaluation Design and Results

Evaluation of the Learning Resource Center program for the year-end report relied on results of a pre- and posttest administration of the California Achievement Tests (Grades K-12). The teachers also used the Stanford Diagnostic Test (Grades 1-12) to assess participating sutdents' learning needs in reading and mathematics skills.

The diagnostic/prescriptive treatment the students receive is geared toward helping the students overcome their learning difficulties so that the emphasis is placed more on the learning process (teaching students how to learn) during their treatment period than on achievement of specific subject matter.

Three questionnaires were constructed and administered to determine attitudes toward and assessment of the Learning Resource Center program. Another questionnaire was constructed and administered to obtain an appraisal of the effectiveness of the In-Service Training program.

EVALUATION DESIGN AND RESULTS

Evaluation of the Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center program for the year-end report relied on results of a pre- and posttest administration of the California Achievement Thsts (CAT), and Stanford Diagnostic Test. These test results are presented for the purpose of giving as complete a test profile of the students as possible.

The diagnostic/prescriptive treatment the students received was geared toward helping the students overcome their learning difficulties so that the emphasis was placed more on the learning process (teaching students how to learn) during their treatment period than on achievement of specific subject matter.

Three questionnaires were constructed and administered to obtain Learning Resource Center teachers, parents, and staff attitudes as well as their assessment of the Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center program. Another questionnaire was constructed to assess the in-service training of the Learning Resource Center Teachers.

EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Appropriate screening and diagnostic instruments were administered and students were selected for prescriptive treatment. The average duration of treatment for participating students was six months.

All students accepted for the diagnostic/prescriptive services of the Learning Resource Center are tested to assess their reading and mathematics

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following is a summary of the highlights of the project;

A. California Achievement Tests (Reading)

1. Grade 1 gained five months.
2. Grade 2 gained eight months.
3. Grade 3 gained seven months.
4. Grade 4 gained ten months.
5. Grade 5 gained ten months.
6. Grade 6 gained eleven months.
7. Grade 7 gained twelve months.
8. Grade 8 gained thirteen months.
9. Grade 9 gained eight months.
10. Grade 10 gained eight months.
11. Grade 11 gained nine months.
12. Grade 12 gained ten months.

B. California Achievement Test (Mathematics)

1. Grade 1 gained seven months.
2. Grade 2 gained ten months.
3. Grade 3 gained eight months.
4. Grade 4 gained ten months.
5. Grade 5 gained nine months.
6. Grade 6 gained ten months.
7. Grade 7 gained fourteen months.
8. Grade 8 gained twelve months.

B. California Achievement Tests (Mathematics) (Cont'd)

9. Grade 9 gained
10. Grade 10 gained
11. Grade 11 gained
12. Grade 12 gained

No data are available

C. Stanford Diagnostic Test (Reading)

1. Grade 1 gained six months.
2. Grade 2 gained seven months.
3. Grade 3 gained six months.
4. Grade 4 gained six months.
5. Grade 5 gained seven months.
6. Grade 6 gained six months.
7. Grade 7 gained ten months.
8. Grade 8 gained eleven months.
9. Grade 9 gained eleven months.
10. Grade 10 gained nine months.
11. Grade 11 gained eight months.
12. Grade 12 gained twelve months.

D. Stanford Diagnostic Test (Mathematics

1. Grade 1 gained seven months.
2. Grade 2 gained six months.
3. Grade 3 gained six months.
4. Grade 4 gained nine months.
5. Grade 5 gained nine months.

D. Stanford Diagnostic Test (Mathematics) (Con't)

6. Grade 6 gained ten months.
7. Grade 7 gained nine months.
8. Grade 8 gained twelve months.
9. Grade 9 gained
10. Grade 10 gained
11. Grade 11 gained — No data are available
12. Grade 12 gained

E. Staff Perceptions of the Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center

1. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of the respondents indicated that the Learning Resource Center's services were helpful to their school.
2. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of the respondents indicated that most teachers have a positive attitude toward the Learning Resource Center.
3. Ninety-four percent (94%) of the respondents indicated that the Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving reading and mathematics skills of participating pupils.
4. Ninety-five percent (95%) of the respondents have indicated that the participating pupils enjoyed going to the Learning Resource Center.
5. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the respondents indicated that the consultant was very helpful to them.
6. Ninety-five percent (95%) of the respondents indicated that the Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving attitudes of participating pupils toward learning.
7. Ninety-eight percent (98%) of the participants indicated that the Learning Resource Center teachers were readily available to them.
8. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of the participants indicated they would refer another child who needed help to the Learning Resource Center.

F. Perceptions of the Learning Resource Center Teachers

a. Need more parental involvement.

b. Need more staff involvement.

c. Less paper work.

d. Need more in-service training for LRC teachers and aids

e. No need for the daily logs (Aide's Logs).

f. More flexibility in the structure of the Learning Resource Center

g. More individualized materials for older children.

h. Order materials to arrive on time.

G. Parents' Perceptions of the Learning Resource Center

1. Ninety-three percent (93%) of the parents indicated that the Learning Resource Center staff have been successful in improving their children's attitude toward learning.

2. Ninety-four percent (94%) or the parents indicated that their children enjoyed going to the Learning Resource Center.

3. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the parents indicated that their children liked the teachers and aides of the Learning Resource Center.

4. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of the parents indicated that the the teachers and aides appeared to be sincerely concerned about their children's education.

H. Staff Perceptions of the In-Service Training Workshops

1. Ninety-two percent (92%) of the respondents indicated that the Analysis of the Workshop Design was very good.

2. Ninety-four percent (94%) of the respondents indicated that the Workshop Procedures were very good.

3. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the respondents indicated that the Workshop Content was very good.

H. Staff Perceptions of the In-Service Training Workshops (Cont'd)

4. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of the respondents indicated that the consultants were very good.

5. Ninety percent (90%) of the respondents indicated that the Workshop outcomes were very good.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the general conclusions drawn from the data of this evaluation and the evaluator's observations, the following recommendations regarding the Learning Resource Center are:

1. Efforts should be made to continue to offer in-service training for the school service assistants in "Developmental Approach to Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teaching."

2. Efforts should be made to continue to offer in-service training for the teachers in "Developmental Approach to Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teaching."

3. Efforts should be made to inform each school staff with guidelines regarding the Learning Resource Center and Title I Rules and Regulations.

4. Efforts should be made to have a better communication with the classroom teachers regarding their students in the Learning Resource Center.

5. Efforts should be made to offer in-service training workshops in mathematics and reading for the school service assistants.

6. Efforts should be made to offer in-service training workshops in the different areas as indicated by the staff.

7. Efforts should be made to supervise school service assistants while they perform instructional duties in every school.

8. Efforts should be made to inform the parents of the target students about the Learning Resource Center and how they can be helpful to their children at home.

9. Efforts should be made to offer in-service training workshops for the parents at the Learning Resource Center.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the procedures used to evaluate the effectiveness of the project in terms of the assessment by the participants of the various aspects of their involvement, the findings showed that the project was effective in implementing the activities and in achieving the objectives. The evaluator strongly recommends that the program should be continued and attempts should be made to follow through with the recommendations.

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTERS

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Rationale

In the Non-Public Schools the Learning Resource Centers were established as a method of resolving the problem of working with Title I students who are underachieving in the area of reading and mathematics. These students' learning difficulties and consequent lack of achievement had not been remediated in the normal reading classroom situation.

Approximately one thousand four hundred and fifty-three students fit into this category and it was expected they would benefit from center treatment. A concerted effort was made by the Learning Resource Centers not only in diagnosing learning problems for target students, but in prescribing those methods which would facilitate or improve the acquisition of skills which in turn will ultimately lead to raising their academic levels of achievement in reading and mathematics.

The Learning Resource Center is a diagnostic/prescriptive-learning program designed to recognize and provide for students with extreme learning difficulties in twenty-eight Non-Public Title I Schools. The staff consisted of three administrators, fifty-four school service assistants and thirty-five teachers.

The staff provided diagnostic/prescriptive treatment for students referred to them. The students are treated individually or in small groups in their own schools. Perceptual training materials, individualized reading and mathematics materials, and staff developed materials were used to meet the needs of each student.

Functions and Responsibilities

The functions and responsibilities of the Learning Resource Centers were to:

1. Diagnose specific learning difficulties.
2. Write and implement prescriptive measures for remediation of handicaps.
3. Develop a plan for communicating information about the Learning Center to schools, community, parents of enrollees and other affected personnel.
4. Collect, organize, analyze, and report information regarding student progress.
5. Develop and maintain a resource material center for parents and teachers.

Operation of the Project

As a means of accomplishing the functions and responsibilities as specified above the following strategies were designed and carried out during the 1980-81 school year and will also be continued by the Learning Resource Center during 1981-82:

A. Eligibility Defined

The Learning Resource Center will be available to any student who is eligible to receive Title I services.

B. Referral Process

The process for student referral to the Learning Resource Center will require the following procedures:

1. Each school will establish a screening team comprised of professional staff members and supportive service personnel to determine a student's need for Learning Resource Center services.
2. Offical referral must be initiated by the local school principal.
3. Referrals will be made to the Learning Resource Center teachers.

C. Diagnostic/Prescriptive Procedures

The following are the outlined procedures to be followed by Learning Center staff:

1. Administration of diagnostic devices.
2. Staffing for evaluation of findings and development of prescription which may include supportive services.
3. Implementation of prescription.
4. Feedback to parents and referring teachers.
5. Evaluation of prescription with revisions as needed.
6. Final evaluation.
7. Dissemination of results.

Monitoring and Documentaiton

Anecdotal and daily logs are kept by all Learning Resource Center staff members. Data related to students involved in the program are collected, organized, analyzed, and reported regarding their progress.

On-site visitations are conducted by the center director to do the following:

a. Observe and assist teachers in the Learning Resource Center.
b. Observe selected Title I students within the classroom setting as a means of assisting classroom teachers in determining a strategy for working with students with severe learning problems.

Project operation is continually reassessed and adjusted on the basis of monitoring the program.

skills. This testing provides the consultants with information on the student's academic needs. All students accepted in this program have demonstrated an inability to learn in the regular classroom despite the best efforts of their teachers. Additional testing is done to determine the most efficient way to teach the individual student before a prescription is developed for therapeutic tutoring. All children in the Learning Resource Center were tested with the California Achievement Tests in grades K-12.

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE EVALUATION

A. Product Objective #1

1. Individuals - Approximately 1363 students, grades 1-12
2. Behavior - will show gains
3. Object of Behavior - in reading
4. Time - September, 1980 to June, 1981
5. Criterion for Success - At least fifty percent of the students in the program will gain one month in reading skills for each month of program participation (7 months).

B. Evaluation Procedures

1. Type - Pretest : April, 1980
   Posttest: April, 1981
2. Participants - These students were selected by staff and principals of each school. Approximately 1363 students, grades 1-12 were selected for the Learning Resource Center.
3. Amount of Time Involved - It was estimated that project participants received four periods of instruction in the Learning Resource Center per week.
4. Analysis Technique - The number of participants who gain at least one month in reading achievement for each month of program participation will be tabulated.
5. Instrument - California Achievement Tests, Grade 1-12 (Reading).
6. Problems - There were a number of students who either took only the pretest or the posttest. These students were not included in the final data.

C. Evaluation Results

1. Criterion - At least fifty percent of the students in the program will gain one month in reading skills for each month of program participation.

2. Results Statement

CAT - Reading

a. Grade 1 gained five months.

b. Grade 2 gained eight months.

c. Grade 3 gained seven months.

d. Grade 4 gained ten months.

e. Grade 5 gained ten months.

f. Grade 6 gained eleven months.

g. Grade 7 gained twelve months.

h. Grade 8 gained thirteen months.

i. Grade 9 gained eight months.

j. Grade 10 gained eight months.

k. Grade 11 gained nine months.

l. Grade 12 gained ten months.

There were five hundred and forty-six or (55%) of the students who gained more than one month in reading skills for each month of program participation.

D. The objective was achieved.

E. Data

See Table 1

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS READING RESULTS

TABLE 1

Grade Level	Total Number of Students Taking both the Pretest & Posttest	Total Student Membership	Average Number of Hours of Instruction per Student per week	Total Hours of Instruction	GEU Pretest Average **	GEU Posttest Average **	GEU Average Gain **
1	-	95	3.5	105	-	1.5	.5
2	123	146	3.6	116	1.2	2.0	.8
3	131	177	3.4	111	1.8	2.5	.7
4	143	178	3.3	107	2.3	3.3	1.0
5	144	167	3.2	107	3.0	4.0	1.0
6	123	155	3.3	108	3.6	4.7	1.1
7	91	122	3.1	101	4.0	5.2	1.2
8	67	90	3.1	101	4.6	5.9	1.3
9	95	140	6.7	390	7.0	7.8	.8
10	46	55	6.7	390	7.2	8.0	.8
11	23	23	6.7	390	6.8	7.7	.9
12	8	15	6.7	390	7.8	8.8	1.0

F. Supplementary Analysis

No supplementary analysis was made for this objective

G. Conclusion

Although the objective was achieved only one half of the students achieved it. Efforts should be made to work more closely with these students and raise the number of students to achieve the objective.

A. Product Objective #2

1. Individuals - Approximately 620 students, grades 1-12

2. Behavior - will show gains

3. Object of Behavior - in mathematics

4. Time - September, 1980 to June, 1981

5. Criterion for Success - At least fifty percent of the students in the program will gain one month in mathematics skills for each month of program participation (6 months).

B. Evaluation Procedures

1. Type - Pretest : April, 1980
Posttest: April, 1981

2. Participants - These students were selected by the staff and principal of each school. Approximately 518 students grade 1-8 were selected for the Learning Resource Center.

3. Amount of Time Involved - It was estimated that the project participants received four periods of instruction in the Learning Resource Center per week.

4. Analysis Technique - The number of participants who gain at least one month in mathematics achievement for each month of program participation will be tabulated.

5. Instrument - California Achievement Test - Grades 1-12 (Mathematics)

6. Problems - There were a number of students who either took only pretest or posttest. These students were not included in the final data.

C. Evaluation Results

1. Criterion - At least fifty percent of the student in the program will gain one month in mathematics skills for each month of program participation.

2. Results Statement:

CAT - Mathematics

a. Grade 1 gained seven months.

b. Grade 2 gained ten months.

c. Grade 3 gained eight months.

d. Grade 4 gained ten months.

e. Grade 5 gained nine months.

f. Grade 6 gained ten months.

g. Grade 7 gained fourteen months.

h. Grade 8 gained twelve months.

i. Grade 9 gained

j. Grade 10 gained

No data are available.

k. Grade 11 gained

l. Grade 12 gained

There were two hundred and ninety-eight or (57%) of the students who gained more than one month in mathematics skills for each month of program participation.

D. The objective was achieved.

E. Data

See Table 2

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS MATHEMATICS RESULTS

TABLE 2

Grade Level	Total Number of Students Taking both the Pretest & Posttest	Total Student Membership	Average Number of Hours of Instruction per Student per week	Total Hours of Instruction	GEU Pretest Average **	GEU Posttest Average **	GEU Average Gain **
1	-	42	2.8	77	-	1.7	.7
2	49	65	2.9	96	1.3	2.3	1.0
3	63	83	3.4	104	2.0	2.8	.8
4	56	75	3.2	100	2.7	3.7	1.0
5	45	49	3.1	96	3.4	4.3	.9
6	69	73	3.1	96	4.3	5.3	1.0
7	65	76	3.3	102	4.4	5.8	1.4
8	49	55	2.8	85	5.3	6.5	1.2
9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

F. Supplementary Analysis

No supplementary analysis was made for this objective

G. Conclusion

Although the objective was achieved only one half of the students achieved it. Efforts should be made to work more closely with these students and raise the number of students to achieve the objective.

A. Product Objective #3

1. Individuals - Approximately 1363 students, grades 1-12

2. Behavior - will show gains

3. Object of behavior - in reading

4. Time - September, 1980 to June, 1981

5. Criterion for Success - At least fifty percent of the students in the program will show an average gain of one month in grade equivalent units in reading for each month of program participation.

B. Evaluation Procedures

1. Type - Pretest : October, 1980
Posttest: May, 1981

2. Participants - These students were selected by staff and principal of each school. Approxiamtely 1363 students, grade 1-12 were selected for the Learning Resource Center for reading.

3. Amount of Time Involved - It was estimated that project participants received four periods of instruction in the Learning Resource Center per week.

4. Analysis Technique - The data will be tabulated and calculated by grade. The data will indicate the mean of grade equivalent gain.

5. Instruments - Stanford Diagnostic Test (Reading)

6. Problems - There were a number of students who either took only the pretest or only the posttest. These students were not included in the final data.

C. Evaluation Results

1. Criterion - At least seventy-five percent of the students in the program will show an average increase of one month in grade equivalent units in reading for each month of program participation.

2. Results Statement

Stanford Diagnostic Test Results (Reading)

a. Grade 1 gained six months.

b. Grade 2 gained seven months.

c. Grade 3 gained six months.

d. Grade 4 gained six months.

e. Grade 5 gained seven months.

f. Grade 6 gained six months.

g. Grade 7 gained ten months.

h. Grade 8 gained eleven months.

i. Grade 9 gained eleven months.

j. Grade 10 gained nine months.

k. Grade 11 gained eight months.

l. Grade 12 gained twelve months.

There were five hundred and seventy-five or (59%) of the students who gained more than one month in reading skills for each month of program participation.

D. The objective was achieved.

E. Data

See Table 3

STANFORD DIAGNOSTIC TEST READING RESULTS

TABLE 3

Grade Level	Total Number of Students Taking both the Pretest & Posttest	Total Student Member-ship	Average Number of Hours of Instruction per Student per week	Total Hours of Instruction	GEU Pretest Average **	GEU Posttest Average **	GEU Average Gain **
1	-	95	3.1	105	-	1.6	.6
2	122	146	3.5	116	1.6	2.3	.7
3	126	177	3.5	111	2.3	2.9	.6
4	118	178	3.4	107	2.9	3.5	.6
5	123	167	3.2	107	3.5	4.2	.7
6	123	155	3.4	108	3.4	4.0	.6
7	100	122	3.1	101	4.3	5.3	1.0
8	75	90	3.1	101	4.9	6.0	1.1
9	117	140	6.7	390	5.3	6.4	1.1
10	47	55	6.7	390	6.3	7.2	.9
11	13	23	6.7	390	5.0	5.8	.8
12	9	15	6.7	390	6.0	7.2	1.2

F. Supplementary Analysis

No supplementary analysis was made for this objective.

G. Conclusion

Although the objective was achieved only one half of the students achieved it. Efforts should be made to work more closely with these students and raise the number of students to achieve the objective.

A. Product Objective #4

1. Individuals - Approximately 518 students, grade 1-12

2. Behavior - will show gains

3. Object of Behavior - in mathematics

4. Time - September, 1980 to June, 1981

5. Criterion for Success - At least seventy-five percent of the students in the program will show an average increase of one month in grade equivalent units in mathematics for each month of program participation.

B. Evaluation Procedures

1. Type - Pretest : October, 1980
   Posttest: May, 1981

2. Participants - These students were selected by the staff and principal of each school. Approximately 518 students, grades 1-12 were selected for the Learning Resource Center for mathematics.

3. Amount of Time Involved - It was estimated that the project participants received four periods of instruction in the Learning Resource Center per week.

4. Analysis Technique - The data will be tabulated and calculated by grade. The data will indicated the mean of grade equivalent gain.

5. Instruments - Stanford Diagnostic Test (Mathematics)

6. Problems - There were a number of students who either took only the pretest or only the posttest. These students were not included in the final data.

C. Evaluation Results

1. Criterion - At least seventy-five percent of the students in the program will show an average increase of one month in grade equivalent units in mathematics for each month of program participation.

2. Results Statement

Stanford Diagnostic Test Results (Mathematics)

a. Grade 1 gained seven months.

b. Grade 2 gained six months.

c. Grade 3 gained six months.

d. Grade 4 gained nine months.

e. Grade 5 gained nine months.

f. Grade 6 gained ten months.

g. Grade 7 gained nine months.

h. Grade 8 gained twelve months.

i. Grade 9 gained

j. Grade 10 gained

No data are available

k. Grade 11 gained

l. Grade 12 gained

There were one hundred and ninety-two or (54%) of the students who gained more than one month in mathematics skills for each month of program participation.

D. The objective was achieved.

E. Data

See Table 4

STANFORD DIAGNOSTIC TEST MATHEMATICS RESULTS

TABLE 4

Grade Level	Total Number of Students Taking both the Pretest & Posttest	Total Student Membership	Average Number of Hours of Instruction per Student per week	Total Hours of Instruction	GEU Pretest Average **	GEU Posttest Average **	GEU Average Gain **
1	-	42	2.8	77	-	1.7	.7
2	32	65	2.9	96	1.5	2.1	.6
3	50	83	3.4	104	2.0	2.6	.6
4	53	75	3.2	100	2.8	3.7	.9
5	39	49	3.1	96	3.5	4.4	.9
6	66	73	3.1	96	4.1	5.1	1.0
7	66	76	3.3	102	4.2	5.1	.9
8	50	55	2.8	85	5.0	6.2	1.2
9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

F. Supplementary Analysis

No supplementary analysis was made for this objective

G. Conclusion

Although the objective was achieved only one half of the students achieved it. Efforts should be made to work more closely with these students and raise the number of students to achieve the objective.

A. Process Objective #1

1. Individuals - Target school personnel, teachers, administrators, and school service assistants

2. Behavior - will benefit

3. Object of Behavior - from the Learning Resource Center's Teachers

4. Time - September, 1980 to June, 1981

5. Criterion for Success - Eighty percent of the respondents will respond positively toward the Learning Resource Center's services.

B. Evaluation Procedures

1. Type - Final Evaluation, May, 1981

2. Participants - Two hundred and sixteen staff members participated.

3. Analysis Technique - The respondents were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement on sixteen statements. The responses were computed for the percent of agreement by the respondents and also for the mean of the scores of each statement. The number of percentage of respondents who marked "strongly agree" or "agree" per item are presented in Table 5. Note that the percent is based on the number responding per item. Those who did not answer were excluded in the computation. A scale of one to four was used for the mean of scores. The score of 1 equals "strongly disagree" and the score of 4 equals "strongly agree." The results are displayed in Table 5.

4. Instruments - Staff Perceptions of the Non-Public Schools Learning Center (See Appendix A). Learning Resource Center Teachers Perceptions (Appendix B).

5. Problems - No major problems were identified by the staff.

C. Evaluation Results

1. Criterion - Eight percent of the respondents will respond positively toward the Learning Resource Center services.

2. Results Statement - Ninety-five percent of the respondents responded positively toward the Learning Resource Center. services. The mean score was 3.5.

D. The objective was achieved.

E. Data

See Table 5

TABLE 5

Staff Perceptions of the Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center

Statements	Number	Percent	Mean of the Scores
1. The Learning Resource Center's helpful to my school.	215/216	99%	3.6
2. Most teachers have a positive attitude toward the Learning Resource Center.	213/216	99	3.5
3. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils' reading skills.	211/216	98	3.4
4. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils' math skills.	104/116	90	3.3
5. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in minimizing participating pupils' learning difficulties.	204/214	95	3.2
6. Teachers have made use of the LRC* teachers' services.	173/191	91	3.3
7. The Learning Resource Center's teacher is readily available to me.	211/215	98	3.8

*LRC - Learning Resource Center

TABLE 5 (Cont'd)

Staff Perceptions of the Non-Public Schools
Learning Resource Center

Statements	Number	Percent	Mean of the Scores
9. The school administration has explained the services of the Learning Resource Center.	192/209	92%	3.4
10. The initial presentation of the Learning Resource Center was adequate to inform me of its services.	203/216	94	3.5
11. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving attitudes of paritic-pating pupils toward learning.	205/315	95	3.2
12. Participating pupils enjoy going to the Learning Resource Center.	199/209	95	3.8
13. The Learning Resource Center consultant has provided me with adequate information about my student's (students') individu-alized prescriptive treatment.	186/206	90	3.3
14. The LRC teacher has been helpful to me.	206/213	97	3.4
15. I would refer another child who needed help to the Learning Resource Center.	214/216	99	3.7

Finally, the respondents were asked to indicate the strengths and/or weaknesses of the Learning Resource Center. Following is a summary of their comments:

Strengths

1. Individualized instruction (195)
2. Excellent and helpful teachers and aides (203)
3. Excellent rapport of LRC staff and their students (129)
4. Excellent cooperation with LRC staff (112)
5. Well organized program (135)
6. Equipment and materials to help the students (127)
7. Positive reinforcement (185)
8. Small group size (173)
9. Pleasant atmosphere (149)

Weaknesses

1. Criteria for accepting students (195)
2. More students need the service of LRC (215)

Finally, the respondents were asked to indicate suggestions for improving the Learning Resource Center. The following are a few of their comments:

> "I think that the students should acknowledge that the Resource Center's main objective is to help improve their weaknesses, so that they may be able to read on their level or as close as possible. Too many students feel that the center is for students who can't read and are classified by peer group as being dumb."

> "I have found our LR teachers to be of invaluable service to me, a classroom teacher. I cannot praise them highly enough. They possess a keen insight in the handling of a child in case of a discipline problem - and definitely have an excellent program designed to meet each of the student's needs. I have received good advice and suggestions on working with my LR students in my own classroom. I am kept abreast of my students' progress, and also provided with many ideas on remedial treatment. The students in my classroom enjoy going to the LR room - which says a lot for the interest generated by the LR teachers."

"To have more teachers as Joan Kozlowski, Joan Fredricks and Louis Gauldez - who have been blessed with a pleasent coupled with a warm and academic concern for these children, who are in desperate need of this attention, need and concern. As long as I have been working with these three teachers they have never failed to share their knowledge and love with the children and faculty. I thank you most gratefully for this terrific program and these traffic teachers."

"Helpful if Learning Resource Center's schedule could coincide with classroom schedule. Also helpful if students could leave the subject they need remediation in. If they could use classroom reading and math books once in a while for reinforcement, it would help. Actually, how can you remediate a subject if you're not using the same material of vocabulary that the students don't know."

"There could be more direct contact between the teacher of the Learning Resource Center and the regular classroom teacher. What each child is working on and the progress of the child would be helpful to me. This refers also to the conduct of the child."

"My only complaint is that by pulling the students out of their regularly scheduled classes they missed the class discussions and explanations that they needed. I don't know if there is any other way around this though. They definitely have benefited from the LRC Program."

"The teachers have been great. The students have improved their skills. The one unfortunate thing is that a student who is very weak and does not live in the correct area cannot be serviced. The service should be offered by need not by address."

"Qualifications should be changed so more students can take advantage of the center. There should be a more formal and regular conference time between the classroom teacher and the resource center teacher - perhaps at least once each quarter outside of classroom time. A good way for teacher's to become acquainted with the center would be a meeting held at the beginning of the year (after students have begun to use the center.) Materials and teaching strategies used with child could be discussed."

"I would like to keep it at this school,and open it to <u>all</u> students. We have students in dire need who were not able to receive services, because of eligibility boundaries."

"Perhaps progress reports could be included in each childs report card to keep parents and teachers informed on a quarterly basis."

"More flexibility. At times it would be profitable for the LRC teacher to work with a small group of her students within the regular classroom in conjunction with the homeroom teacher. Better define line of supervision in regard to employees."

"A rose to each of the aides and a dozen to Sr. Claire for all their loving help for each child."

"Sometimes the lab and I work things out and then they are changed by an administrator of Title I who is NOT in the school. I feel this continued interference is extremely detrimental to staff morale (the lab's) and to the working relationship of the staff with the school faculty. I'd like to discuss this further with whomever can remedy the situation."

"Changes in criteria for acceptance, ie: residence, test results are a good indicator, but sometimes a good student who tests low is accepted while a student with serious problems who guesses on a test is turned down due to an inaccurate test score."

"Make the program available to all in need."

"I would like to see an actual demonstration, possibly in the classroom, so that some of the techniques can be carried on in the classroom and benefit others. I also would like to visit the learning center during my children's attendance. This is difficult due to the fact that the classroom teacher is also teaching."

"Residency requirement elimination - children should be taken because of their need and not where they live."

"Although I realize how much red tape must be dealth with to quality, I wish more of the kids who really need individual help could have gone to the LRC. I take some blame for the point, since I didn't go up to the center or make myself more available to the teacher and aide at times when we really could talk. But I wish my students' program in the LRC could have been more closely coordinated with the work we were doing in class. What he did up in the LRC was work he did need; but there were other needs that sometimes were more pressing."

Perceptions of the Learning Center Teachers and School Service Assistance

There were sixty-seven instruments returned by LRC teachers and school service assistants who comments with two general statements dealing with the Learning Resource Center.

1. Specific suggestions for the improvement of your Learning Resource Center:

   a. Need more parental involvement.

   b. Need more staff involvement.

   c. Less paper work.

   d. Need more in-service training for LRC teachers and aides.

   e. No need for the daily logs.

   f. More flexibility in the structure of the Learning Resource Center.

   g. More individualized materials for older children.

   h. Order materials to arrive on time.

2. Comments about the Learning Resource Center:

   "I think the system with the unified prescription forms was great. No matter what school you went to, everyone's prescription was basically the same. Also the CAT test throughout the whole school system was another blessing. No matter where you go the Learning Resource Center staff is great. Everyone is so friendly and kind. We're one big happy family!"

   "The center is a very necessary room in our school. We have many students who are very slow in reading and math, and they definitely need the extra help and attention that our center provides them. The prescription form implemented this year made our jobs much easier. By writing the general prescription each week, along with materials to be used, my aides know exactly what do do with each student. This enabled me to spend my time teaching rather than explaining directions for the aides."

   "The need of workshop to assess students and materials for the Learning Center. To help provide service for the students."

"Title I has helped children not only in reading and math, but in emotional and physical needs. And these factors do hinder good learning in children.

"I think the LRC is a great benefit for the kids who receive our help. It provides a service that otherwise would leave these children in a learning limbo."

"The LRC is working very well this year, 80-81. The only aspect that might improve is the communication between classroom teacher and LRC. This could be improved by allowing one day a month for conferences about LRC students. This would enable both teachers to better provide for the instructional needs of the LRC student."

"I wish their could be a pamphlet given to each parent a our schools. More information concerning what Learning Resource Center is all about.

"I believe a Learning Resource teacher would benefit by observing another LR teacher in action. An exchange of ideas, methods of management, and handling of behavior problems would be some reasons for a visit. It would help a 'new' teacher and make an experience teacher feel good to offer a helping hand. The grading isn't the best, submitting the marks in Achievement, Effort, and Conduct to the homeroom teacher then she or he combines it with her marks. In the classroom, the pupil is functioning at his grade level; in the LRC, the pupil might be working one to three grade levels below. I don't know the solution, but do not feel the present system is good."

"My job is exciting because my aide is energetic, enthusiastic, congenial and cooperative! She follows my lead, is patient and expects no nonsense from students! If she has a correction or suggestion she does it in private and supports me always in front of the class. She makes each individual student feel worthy and important. She's flexible and able to change quickly if necessary. She is organized and strictly honest about putting in her hours, and adds a lot to the class apprection of new materials I present."

"Our Learning Resource Center is bright and cheerful. Students are in a happy mood when the come to us and cooperate with our plan for learning. It's quite easy to read their signals when we try to give them work beyond their capacity. My aide, is very creative and generous in helping to develop the student's skills in reading. She is also very good in helping and encouraging the student who, on occasion, is in an emotional low mood and needs more attention than usual."

"I feel that the program would benefit the students more if all teachers and aides coming into the program were given a more detailed explanation of what is expected in the center. It takes too much trial and error to arrive at a good workable center. I feel that each year our center has impoved but when I started the teacher was also new and we were very uncertain as to what was expected. I feel very strongly that some type of orientation be given to all new employees with the program."

"I believe that the LRC is working very well this year 1980-81. It would be most helpful, however, if LRC teachers and classroom teachers had a specified time allotted to have conferences about each LRC student. I also feel that it would be a good idea to allow students who need servicing, and are living outside the Title I area, to be able to attend the LRC after Title I eligible students have been given first consideration."

"I think the LRC is a very good program. The principal and teachers have a positive attitude towards the program.

Because of the small groups we are able to help improve the student's reading skills and self-confidence. The child has a sense of achievement.

The only suggestion for improvement here at St. _____ would be expanding it to include students that needed help, but could not receive it because of the eligibility boundries.

The teacher at St. _____ is an excellent, dedicated and caring person. She has a great concern for each and every atudent."

"My personal feelings are that I believe the LRC works. I feel that it should be open more to children with the need for the service, and not depend so much on where the child lives. There are a lot of children who would benefit from the services in the LRC, but are not eligible for the program.

I have very much enjoyed my work in the program. I have been very fortunate to work with a very dedicated and hard-working teacher who truly cares about each child. She has helped to make this a very happy and productive year for her students and aides as well. I'm looking forward to next year in the LRC, too."

"I have had a very positive outlook on the LRC room this year. I have increased my knowledge on several skills and therefore been able to reinforce skills to children. The teacher in the LRC room has been wonderful to work with."

"I would like more time to share with other teachers and aides about methods and procedures that work."

"It need to provide more opportunities for teachers and parents to visit center during school."

A. Process Objective #2

1. Individuals - Parents of participating students

2. Behavior - will benefit

3. Object of Behavior - from the information provided from the LRC

4. Time - September, 1980 to June, 1981

5. Criterion for Success - Eighty percent of the respondents will respond positively toward the LRC.

B. Evaluation Procedures

1. Type - Final evaluation questionnaires, May, 1981.

2. Participants - Three hundred and forty-eight parents of participating students.

3. Nonparticipants - No nonparticipants were involved in a comparison group.

4. Analysis Technique - A questionnaire, designed to determine parents' attitude toward and assessment of the Learning Resource Center program and services was administered during the last week of May, 1981.

   The data collected by the questionnaire are presented in Table 6. The data were given the same statistical treatment as the teacher questionnaire.

   There were three hundred and forty-eight instruments returned by parents of participating students, who commented on the statements dealing with the program. The respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the statements. The number and percentage of respondents who marked "yes" on each item are presented in Table 6. Note that the percent is based on the number responding per item. Those who did not answer were excluded in the computation.

5. Instruments - Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center-Parent (See Appendix C).

6. Problems - No problems were identified with the parents. However, more parents could have been involved.

C. Evaluation Results

1. Criterion - Eighty percent of the respondents will rate the Learning Center and the In-service Training Workshops satisfactory.

2. Results Statement - The mean average of fifteen statements concerning effectiveness of the Learning Center was 88%.

D. The objective was achieved.

E. Data

See Table 6.

TABLE 6

Parents Perceptions of the Learning Resource Center

Statements	Number	Percent
1. The Learning Resource Center's staff have been successful in improving my child's attitude toward learning.	301/323	93%
2. My child enjoys going to the Learning Resource Center.	326/348	94
3. The Learning Resource Center's staff have provided me with adequate information about my child's achievement.	278/345	81
4. My child likes the teacher and aides of the Learning Resource Center.	338/347	97
5. The teacher and aides appear to be sincerely concerned about my child's education.	323/327	99
6. I am pleased that my child is attending the Learning Resource Center.	349/355	98
7. I would like to have my child continue in the Learning Resource Center if it is at all possible.	323/343	94

TABLE 6

Parents Perceptions of the
Learning Resource Center

	Statements	Number	Percent
8.	I have seen some improvement in my child's reading skills since he/she has been in the Learning Resource Center.	330/335	98%
9.	I have seen some improvement in my child's mathematics skills since he/she has been in the Learning Resource Center.	222/241	92
10.	I would like to have more communication with the teacher and aides of the Learning Resource Center.	289/334	86
11.	I would like to know more about the Learning Resource Center.	315/343	92
12.	I would like to attend workshops for parents in the Learning Resource Center.	194/309	63
13.	I have visited and observed the activities at the Learning Resource Center.	131/220	59

Finally, the parents were asked to indicate any suggestions for improving the Learning Resource Center. The following are some of their comments:

> "Better communication between the Learning Resource Center and parents as to what parents can do at home to help their children. Let parents know when they can visit the LRC to observe and know better what their child is actually doing. Let parents know at the beginning of the school year what a child is being helped in and pinpoint more directly what help a child is receiving in Math or Reading. Periodic notes to inform parents of child's progress and behavior so that parents can work along with the LRC in helping their child. Would like for children to use their classroom books and receive more direct help from their books in the LRC."

"I would like some contact with the learning center to know what type of help I can provide my child at home. We have tried different ways, even buying all sorts of work books at lower levels and have tried bringing him up but if we had some type of guidance it would help."

"I think there should be more cooperation between the learning center and the school staff. My daughter felt more relaxed and received more attention in the center. It seems she does better there than in the classroom."

"I feel the resource center is a very good learning tool to help my child. I see lots of improvement in my childs reading when he applies himself. I have no real improvement suggestions, but they do a great job. I would like to visit the resource center but I am working during the day."

"I am very pleased that John has the opportunity to improve his reading skills. I have two suggestions: 1. I sometimes can't tell which homework comes from the LRC or regular classwork. Could a label be used, i.e., 'L.R.C.', 2. When I had my conference - Sr. showed me exactly where John excelled and lagged behind. Could we receive an index card with his beginning level and his end of year level? We could see where John has improved. I have noticed John is enjoying his reading at home. I see him reading for pleasure, choosing books by himself, etc."

"I was not asked if my son could be put in the learning center. After his first report card I talked to his teacher and she informed me that Michael was a little behind his class and the learning center was to help reinforce what he knows and help him keep up. I have never been contacted by the learning center teachers so I really don't have any idea what they are doing And I don't know if I will allow my son in it next year."

"The only comment I have is that I would like more information about the Learning Resource Center so that I may help my son with some of the projects and goals of the Center."

"It would be nice if the school first informed the parents of the student that he was being involved in a program which would pull him out of his normal academic classes."

"I think it is a good program. My niece is a slow learning and she can stand more improvement in het attitude towards learning, but she has come a long way in comparison to when she was in public school. At that time, she couldn't read 1s, and, he and she. She's still slow, but much improved. I help her at home and, at the same time, try to promote a positive attitude towards learning. This, too, is a slow process but much improved."

"The center is very helpful as far as my childs education. However, I'd like to see a better record of my child's achievement. I've yet to see my child's records or work do in the center. My child does enjoy LRC and has improved the reading skill as far as listening to her read aloud. Keep up the good work."

"More information on child's progress and what I could do to help her improve at home."

"More information regarding the center. Send regular student evaluations home monthly. Send materials home for parents to reinforce facts learned. Open a summer program 4 times a week."

"Workshops for parents, if at all possible, should be held after 5:00 p.m. to enable working mothers to be involved as much as possible."

"More ideas for helping my child at home."

"More information on expectations, goals, objectives and have home materials provided by the center so parents can reinforce work at home. I like the positive attitude my child has towards the center rather than a negative - inferior one she had in the public school last year. (See was in a learning center also.)"

"The learning Resource Center has proven to be helpful to the children. The teachers are good but, I think the work should be presented to the children in such a way that it would make learning seem to be fun, not a hard task. Sometimes, I think they expect too much from the children at one time. So making it seem to be fun would make it much more interesting and the kids would love to learn."

"The teacher and aides are doing outstanding work. Thank you very much."

"To whom it may concern, my son Jason has shown tremendous improvement since he has been attending the Learning Center."

"I would like to be provided with more information concerning Learning Resource Center. I have just become aware of its existence and I am sure there is a lot of information I need to familiarize myself with."

"We are very happy with the center and it sure did help our daughter a lot. We like to thank the teacher and the aides for the very good job they are doing."

F. Supplementary Analysis

No supplementary analysis was made for this objective.

G. Conclusion

Efforts should be made to inform the target parents about the services provided for them and their children.

A. Process Objective #3

1. Individuals - Learning Resource Center staff

2. Behavior - will receive

3. Objective of Behavior - in-service training

4. Time - September, 1980 to June, 1981

5. Measurement - In-service Training Instruments

6. Criterion for Success - Eighty percent of the respondents will rate In-service Training Workshop satisfactory.

B. Evaluation, Design, Procedures

1. Type - Final evaluation questionnaires.

2. Participants - Learning Resource Center staff.

3. Amount of Time Involved - About three hours per workshop.

4. Analysis Technique - There were sixty-six instruments returned by staff members who commented on sixteen different statements dealing with in-service training workshops. A five point scale was used to rate the in-service training. "Low" was indicated with number "1" and "High" was indic indicated with number "5." Means of the responses were computed. The results are displayed in Table 7.

5. Instruments - In-service Evaluation Questionnaie (See Appendix D).

C. Evaluation Results

1. Criterion - Eighty percent of the respondents will rate the In-service Training Workshops satisfactory.

2. Results Statement - a. The mean positive average concerning effectiveness of the In-service Training was 88%.

b. In a five point scale the mean of the scores was 3.3.

D. The objective was achieved.

E. Data

See Table 7

TABLE 7

Final Evaluation In-Service
Training Instrument

Statements	Number of Respondents	Percent of Positive Responses	Mean of the Scores
ANALYSIS OF WORKSHOP DESIGN			
1. There was sufficient time to achieve the workshop's stated objectives.	63/66	95%	3.2
2. The physical setting and facilities were suitable for the workshop functions.	54/66	82	3.0
3. The day, time of day, and/or general timing of the workshop was appropriate for its purpose.	59/66	89	3.2
4. The workshop activities were well structured and organized.	60/80	100	3.1
WORKSHOP PROCEDURES			
1. The training procedures used in the workshop were appropriate to its goals.	36/36	100	3.5
2. The training format provided ample opportunities for active involvement and personal interaction with the consultants and other participants.	59/66	89	3.2
3. The size of the workshop training group was about right for its purpose.	60/64	94	3.1

TABLE 7 (Cont'd)

Final Evaluation In-Service
Training Instrument

Statements	Number of Respondents	Percent of Positive Responses	Mean of the Scores
WORKSHOP CONTENT			
1. The workshop goals and objectives were clearly defined and presented.	62/66	94%	3.2
2. Workshop discussions were centered on topics directly related to the workshop goals.	65/65	100	3.3
CONSULTANT(S) SERVICES			
1. The consultants were knowledgeable and skillful in their presentation and program activities.	66/66	100	3.6
2. The consultants proceeded at a moderate enough pace allowing for a clear understanding by the participants.	65/66	98	3.5
3. The consultants were genuinely concerned with the progress of the participants.	66/66	100	3.5
4. The consultants' program activities were planned and presented in agreement with your perception of the workshop goals and objectives.	64/66	97	3.4
WORKSHOP OUTCOMES			
1. There was considerable agreement between the workshop's stated objectives and what I actually gained.	60/66	91	3.3

TABLE 7

Final Evaluation In-Service
Training Instrument

Statements	Number of Respondents	Percent of Positive Responses	Mean of the Scores
WORKSHOP OUTCOMES (Cont'd)			
3. The presentations stimulated further thought and interest in my daily working situation.	59/65	91%	3.3
4. Most of the ideas gained in the workshop(s) will be used in my instruction.	57/63	90	3.2
5. Most of the ideas gained in the workshop(s) will be shared with my colleagues.	56/65	86	3.2

The respondents were also asked to comment on strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions for improving future workshops. The results are as follows:

Strengths of the workshop

Consultants	(54)
Materials and/or Exercises	(33)
Director	(17)
Group Participants	(22)
Goals and Objectives	(27)

Weaknesses of the Workshop

There were no major weaknesses indicated by the respondents. However, some of the respondents made the following comments and suggestions:

Suggestions for Future Workshops:

"Dr. Strong's workshop concerning teaching skills was exceptional. Another workshop pertaining to behavioral modification would be an excellent follow through. How do you handle the problem student (constant talkers, stubborness, outright defiance, motivation, etc.)?"

"The workshop given by Dr. Strong was excellent. More workshops on behavior and controlling children by the aides would be appreciated."

"Divide workshops between practical teaching techniques and updates on such topics as - the causes of Reading Disability, etc."

"More workshops on controlling behavior, and helpful hints and information for the aides would be useful."

"A workshop on behavior modification."

"How about a workshop where different kinds of math materials are shown so that we will be aware of new materials that are available."

"I would like to see more workshops for I.S.A. Elementary and Junior High."

"I would like to see more in-service for new teachers. I thought I was not really prepared to take over that center. Maybe I didn't ask the right or enough questions."

"There sould be a more 'basic' workshop or training session for new aides so they will know more what to expect and what is expected of them. It could also familiarize them with some of the materials and the many different forms, etc., that they will be using."

"Better scheduling (beginning or end of year only - otherwise they disrupt continuity). Nicer work environment. Relevant topics - those of us who have had education classes have already covered the topics discussed. Why not ask for our suggestions, and base the workshops on NEEDS???"

"If there is a combined workshop for teachers and aides, the consultants should speak on a level that all of us can understand. I appreciate all the workshops but I was a little fustrated in one of them."

F. Supplementary Analysis

No supplementary analysis was made for this objective.

G. Conclusion

The workshop ratings were very positive. However, it is very difficult to have workshops with the whole staff at the same time. It is highly recommended that efforts should be made to offer inservice training workshops for professional and paraprofessional staff.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF THE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING CENTER

Detroit Public Schools	STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF THE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS TITLE I LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER	Research and Evaluation Department

The basic purpose of the Learning Resource Center is to provide meaningful programs which will lead to improved performance by Title I target population pupils.

In seeking to achieve this goal, an evaluation of the Learning Resource Center is conducted in order to gain information relative to its strengths and weaknesses. The ESEA, Title I federal agency which provides funds for the Center's operation requires such an evaluation.

Therefore, your assistance is needed to provide information based on your personal assessment of the effectiveness of the Learning Resource Center. This activity is intended to take approximately five to ten minutes.

Consider for a moment your own position and feelings regarding the Learning Resource Center. Then please react to <u>each</u> of the following statements or questions as they apply to you. Your frank reactions will provide us with useful information which can be used to improve the Learning Resource Center.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Mike Syropoulos, Ed.D.
Evaluator
Research and Evaluation Department

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH STATEMENT.

SA - <u>Strongly Agree</u>: You strongly agree with the statement.

A - <u>Agree</u>: You agree more than you disagree.

D - <u>Disagree</u>: You disagree more than you agree.

SD - <u>Strongly Disagree</u>: You strongly disagree with the statement.

N - <u>Not Applicable</u>: Does not apply or don't know. Circle when you feel this statement does not apply or you simply cannot answer the question.

1. The Learning Resource Center's services are helpful to my school.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
2. Most teachers have a positive attitude toward the Learning Resource Center.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
3. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils' reading skills.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
4. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils' math skills.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
5. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in minimizing participating pupils' learning difficulties.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
6. Teachers have made use of the Learning Resource Center's teacher services.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
7. The Learning Resource Center's teacher is readily available to me.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
8. The school administration has explained the services of the Learning Resource Center.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
9. The initial presentation of the Learning Resource Center was adequate to inform me of its services.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
10. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving attitudes of participating pupils toward learning.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
11. Participating pupils enjoy going to the Learning Resource Center.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
12. The Learning Resource Center's teacher has provided me with adequate information about my student's individualized prescriptive treatment.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
13. The Learning Resource Center's teacher has been helpful to me.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
14. I would refer another child who needed help to the Learning Resource Center.	SA	A	D	SD	NA

15. How many times did you visit the Learning Resource Center during the 1980-81 school year?

_____

16. How many times did you talk to the teacher regarding your students attending the Learning Resource Center?

_____

17. What were the strengths and/or weaknesses of the Learning Resource Center?

Strengths:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

Weaknesses:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

18. Please make any suggestions for improving the Learning Resource Center.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER
TEACHERS PERCEPTIONS

Detroit Public Schools	CONSULTANTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS TITLE I LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER	Research and Evaluation Department

The basic purpose of the Learning Center is to provide meaningful programs which will lead to improved performance by Title I target population pupils.

In seeking to achieve this goal, an evaluation of the Learning Center is conducted in order to gain information relative to its strengths and weaknesses. The ESEA, Title I federal agency which provides funds for the Center's operation requires such an evaluation.

Therefore, your assistance is needed to provide information based on your personal assessment of the effectiveness of the Learning Center. This activity is intended to take approximately five to ten minutes.

Consider for a moment your own position and feelings regarding the Learning Center. Then please react to each of the following statements or questions as they apply to you. Your frank reactions will provide us with useful information which can be used to improve the Learning Resource Center.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Mike Syropoulos, Ed.D.
Evaluator
Research and Evaluation Department

1. Please make specific suggestions for the improvement of your Learning Resource Center.

   1. _____

   _____

   2. _____

   _____

   3. _____

   _____

   4. _____

   _____

   5. _____

   _____

   6. _____

   _____

7. _____

_____

8. _____

_____

2. Please make any comments you wish about the Learning Resource Center.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

PARENTS PERCEPTIONS OF THE LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER

Detroit Public Schools	NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE	Research and Evaluation Department

Dear Parent:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain your evaluation of the services provided to you and your child by the Learning Resource Center.

An evaluation of each of the projects supported by funds from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I is required under terms of the contract between the Detroit Board of Education and the Funding Agency.

I would be extremely grateful to you if you would take your time and effort to help with this important evaluation.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mike Syropoulos, Ed.D.
Evaluator
Research and Evaluation Department

Name of school your child is attending: _____

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE THE CORRECT RESPONSE TO EACH STATEMENT
Yes - No or Don't Know (Doesn't apply)

Please indicate how characteristic (or true) each statement is of the teacher and/or aides of the Learning Resource Center:

1. The Learning Resource Center's staff have been successful in improving my child's attitude toward learning. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

2. My child enjoys going to the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

3. The Learning Resource Center's staff have provided me with adequate information about my child's achievement. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

4. My child likes the teacher and aides of the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know___

5. The teacher and aides appear to be sincerely concerned about my child's education. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know___

6. I am pleased that my child is attending the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

7. I would like to have my child continue in the Learning Resource Center if it is at all possible. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

8. I have seen some improvement in my child's reading skills since he/she has been in the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

9. I have seen some improvement in my child's mathematics skills since he/she has been in the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

10. I would like to have more communication with the teacher and aides of the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

11. I would like to know more about the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know___

12. I would like to attend workshops for parents in the Learning Resource Center Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

13. I have visited and observed the activities at the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

14. Please note any suggestions for improving the Learning Resource Center services.

APPENDIX D

FINAL EVALUATION IN-SERVICE
TRAINING INSTRUMENT

Detroit Public Schools	FINAL EVALUATION INSERVICE TRAINING WORKSHOPS	Research and Evaluation Department

One of the basic purposes of this project is to provide meaningful inservice programs for professional and paraprofessional staff members (and parents) which will lead to improved performance by Title I or Title IV-C target population pupils.

In seeking to achieve this goal, an evaluation of the Inservice Training Workshops is conducted in order to gain information relative to its strengths and weaknesses. The ESEA, Title I, and Title IV-C federal agencies which provide funds for these projects require such an evaluation.

Therefore, your assistance is needed to provide information based on your personal assessment of the effectiveness of the total Inservice Training Workshop you have attended during the 1980-81 school year.

Consider for a moment your own position and feelings regarding the Inservice Training. Then please react to <u>each</u> of the following statements or questions as they apply to you. Your frank reactions will provide us with useful information which can be used to improve the Inservice Training.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Mike Syropoulos, Ed.D
Evaluator, Research and
Evaluation Department

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH STATEMENT.

SA - Strongly Agree: You strongly agree with statement.

A - Agree: You agree more than you disagree.

D - Disagree: You disagree more than you agree.

SD - Strongly Disagree: You strongly disagree with statement.

NA - Not Applicable: Does not apply or don't know. Circle when you feel this statement does not apply, or you simply cannot answer the question.

ANALYSIS OF WORKSHOP DESIGN

1.	There was sufficient time to achieve the workshop's stated objectives.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ___
2.	The physical setting and facilities were suitable for the workshop functions.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ___
3.	The day, time of day, and/or general timing of the workshop(s) was appropriate for this purpose.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ___
4.	The workshop(s') activities were well structured and organized.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ___

WORKSHOP PROCEDURES

1.	The training procedures used in the workshop(s) were appropriate to its goals.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ___
2.	The training format provided ample opportunities for active involvement and personal interaction with the consultants and other participants.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ___
3.	The size of the workshop(s) training group(s) was about right for its purpose.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ___

WORKSHOP CONTENT

1.	The workshop(s) goals and objectives were clearly defined and presented.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ___
2.	Workshop discussions were centered on topics directly related to the workshop goals.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ___

CONSULTANT(S) SERVICES

1. The consultants were knowledgeable and skillful in their presentation and implementation of the program activities.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	____
2. The consultants proceeded at a moderate enough pace allowing for a clear understanding by the participants.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	____
3. The consultants were genuinely concerned with the progress of the participants.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	____
4. The consultants program activities were planned and presented in agreement with your perception of the workshop goals and objectives.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	____

WORKSHOP OUTCOMES

1. There was considerable agreement between the workshop's stated objectives and what I actually gained.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	____
2. The ideas presented were appropriate for my backgrounds and needs.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	____
3. The presentation stimulated further thought and interest in my daily working situation.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	____
4. Most of the ideas gained in the workshop(s) will be used in my instruction.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	____
5. Most of the ideas gained in the workshop(s) will be shared with my colleagues.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	____

6. How many workshops and/or conferences did you attend during the 1980-81 school year? _____

7. Please list some of the workshop and/or conferences you have attended.

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

d. _____

e. _____

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

What were the strengths of the workshops? Please check:

Consultants'	☐	Director	☐
Materials and/or exercises	☐	Group participants	☐
Audiovisual materials (if any)	☐	Goals and Objectives	☐

Other ☐ (Please explain) _____

What were the weaknesses of the workshops? Please check:

Consultants	☐	Director	☐
Materials and/or exercises	☐	Group participants	☐
Audiovisual materials (if any)	☐	Goals and Objectives	☐

Other ☐ (Please explain) _____

Please note any suggestions for improving future workshops.
(Use other side if necessary.)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF THE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING CENTER

Detroit Public Schools	STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF THE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS TITLE I LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER	Research and Evaluation Department

The basic purpose of the Learning Resource Center is to provide meaningful programs which will lead to improved performance by Title I target population pupils.

In seeking to achieve this goal, an evaluation of the Learning Resource Center is conducted in order to gain information relative to its strengths and weaknesses. The ESEA, Title I federal agency which provides funds for the Center's operation requires such an evaluation.

Therefore, your assistance is needed to provide information based on your personal assessment of the effectiveness of the Learning Resource Center. This activity is intended to take approximately five to ten minutes.

Consider for a moment your own position and feelings regarding the Learning Resource Center. Then please react to <u>each</u> of the following statements or questions as they apply to you. Your frank reactions will provide us with useful information which can be used to improve the Learning Resource Center.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Mike Syropoulos, Ed.D.
Evaluator
Research and Evaluation Department

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH STATEMENT.

SA - <u>Strongly Agree</u>: You strongly agree with the statement.

A - <u>Agree</u>: You agree more than you disagree.

D - <u>Disagree</u>: You disagree more than you agree.

SD - <u>Strongly Disagree</u>: You strongly disagree with the statement.

NA - <u>Not Applicable</u>: Does not apply or don't know. Circle when you feel this statement does not apply or you simply cannot answer the question.

1. The Learning Resource Center's services are helpful to my school.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
2. Most teachers have a positive attitude toward the Learning Resource Center.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
3. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils' reading skills.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
4. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils' math skills.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
5. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in minimizing participating pupils' learning difficulties.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
6. Teachers have made use of the Learning Resource Center's teacher services.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
7. The Learning Resource Center's teacher is readily available to me.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
8. The school administration has explained the services of the Learning Resource Center.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
9. The initial presentation of the Learning Resource Center was adequate to inform me of its services.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
10. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving attitudes of participating pupils toward learning.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
11. Participating pupils enjoy going to the Learning Resource Center.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
12. The Learning Resource Center's teacher has provided me with adequate information about my student's individualized prescriptive treatment.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
13. The Learning Resource Center's teacher has been helpful to me.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
14. I would refer another child who needed help to the Learning Resource Center.	SA	A	D	SD	NA

15. How many times did you visit the Learning Resource Center during the 1980-81 school year?

_____

16. How many times did you talk to the teacher regarding your students attending the Learning Resource Center?

_____

17. What were the strengths and/or weaknesses of the Learning Resource Center?

Strengths:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

Weaknesses:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

18. Please make any suggestions for improving the Learning Resource Center.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER
TEACHERS PERCEPTIONS

Detroit Public Schools	CONSULTANTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS TITLE I LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER	Research and Evaluation Department

The basic purpose of the Learning Center is to provide meaningful programs which will lead to improved performance by Title I target population pupils.

In seeking to achieve this goal, an evaluation of the Learning Center is conducted in order to gain information relative to its strengths and weaknesses. The ESEA, Title I federal agency which provides funds for the Center's operation requires such an evaluation.

Therefore, your assistance is needed to provide information based on your personal assessment of the effectiveness of the Learning Center. This activity is intended to take approximately five to ten minutes.

Consider for a moment your own position and feelings regarding the Learning Center. Then please react to each of the following statements or questions as they apply to you. Your frank reactions will provide us with useful information which can be used to improve the Learning Resource Center.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Mike Syropoulos, Ed.D.
Evaluator
Research and Evaluation Department

1. Please make specific suggestions for the improvement of your Learning Resource Center.

   1. _____

   _____

   2. _____

   _____

   3. _____

   _____

   4. _____

   _____

   5. _____

   _____

   6. _____

   _____

7. _____

_____

8. _____

_____

2. Please make any comments you wish about the Learning Resource Center.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

PARENTS PERCEPTIONS OF THE
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER

Detroit Public Schools	NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE	Research and Evaluation Department

Dear Parent:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain your evaluation of the services provided to you and your child by the Learning Resource Center.

An evaluation of each of the projects supported by funds from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I is required under terms of the contract between the Detroit Board of Education and the Funding Agency.

I would be extremely grateful to you if you would take your time and effort to help with this important evaluation.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mike Syropoulos, Ed.D.
Evaluator
Research and Evaluation Department

Name of school your child is attending: _____

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE THE CORRECT RESPONSE TO EACH STATEMENT
Yes - No or Don't Know (Doesn't apply)

Please indicate how characteristic (or true) each statement is of the teacher and/or aides of the Learning Resource Center:

1. The Learning Resource Center's staff have been successful in improving my child's attitude toward learning. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

2. My child enjoys going to the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

3. The Learning Resource Center's staff have provided me with adequate information about my child's achievement. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

4. My child likes the teacher and aides of the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

5. The teacher and aides appear to be sincerely concerned about my child's education. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

6. I am pleased that my child is attending the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

7. I would like to have my child continue in the Learning Resource Center if it is at all possible. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

8. I have seen some improvement in my child's reading skills since he/she has been in the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

9. I have seen some improvement in my child's mathematics skills since he/she has been in the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

10. I would like to have more communication with the teacher and aides of the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

11. I would like to know more about the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know___

12. I would like to attend workshops for parents in the Learning Resource Center Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

13. I have visited and observed the activities at the Learning Resource Center. Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___

14. Please note any suggestions for improving the Learning Resource Center services.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX D

FINAL EVALUATION IN-SERVICE
TRAINING INSTRUMENT

Detroit Public Schools	FINAL EVALUATION: INSERVICE TRAINING WORKSHOPS	Research and Evaluation Department

One of the basic purposes of this project is to provide meaningful inservice programs for professional and paraprofessional staff members (and parents) which will lead to improved performance by Title I or Title IV-C target population pupils.

In seeking to achieve this goal, an evaluation of the Inservice Training Workshops is conducted in order to gain information relative to its strengths and weaknesses. The ESEA, Title I, and Title IV-C federal agencies which provide funds for these projects require such an evaluation.

Therefore, your assistance is needed to provide information based on your personal assessment of the effectiveness of the total Inservice Training Workshop you have attended during the 1980-81 school year.

Consider for a moment your own position and feelings regarding the Inservice Training. Then please react to each of the following statements or questions as they apply to you. Your frank reactions will provide us with useful information which can be used to improve the Inservice Training.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Mike Syropoulos, Ed.D
Evaluator, Research and
Evaluation Department

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH STATEMENT.

SA - Strongly Agree: You strongly agree with statement.

A - Agree: You agree more than you disagree.

D - Disagree: You disagree more than you agree.

SD - Strongly Disagree: You strongly disagree with statement.

NA - Not Applicable: Does not apply or don't know. Circle when you feel this statement does not apply, or you simply cannot answer the question.

ANALYSIS OF WORKSHOP DESIGN

1. There was sufficient time to achieve the workshop's stated objectives. SA A D SD NA ____

2. The physical setting and facilities were suitable for the workshop functions. SA A D SD NA ____

3. The day, time of day, and/or general timing of the workshop(s) was appropriate for this purpose. SA A D SD NA ____

4. The workshop(s') activities were well structured and organized. SA A D SD NA ____

WORKSHOP PROCEDURES

1. The training procedures used in the workshop(s) were appropriate to its goals. SA A D SD NA ____

2. The training format provided ample opportunities for active involvement and personal interaction with the consultants and other participants. SA A D SD NA ____

3. The size of the workshop(s) training group(s) was about right for its purpose. SA A D SD NA ____

WORKSHOP CONTENT

1. The workshop(s) goals and objectives were clearly defined and presented. SA A D SD NA ____

2. Workshop discussions were centered on topics directly related to the workshop goals. SA A D SD NA ____

CONSULTANT(S) SERVICES

1.	The consultants were knowledgeable and skillful in their presentation and implementation of the program activities.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ____
2.	The consultants proceeded at a moderate enough pace allowing for a clear understanding by the participants.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ____
3.	The consultants were genuinely concerned with the progress of the participants.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ____
4.	The consultants program activities were planned and presented in agreement with your perception of the workshop goals and objectives.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ____

WORKSHOP OUTCOMES

1.	There was considerable agreement between the workshop's stated objectives and what I actually gained.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ____
2.	The ideas presented were appropriate for my backgrounds and needs.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ____
3.	The presentation stimulated further thought and interest in my daily working situation.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ____
4.	Most of the ideas gained in the workshop(s) will be used in my instruction.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ____
5.	Most of the ideas gained in the workshop(s) will be shared with my colleagues.	SA	A	D	SD	NA ____

6. How many workshops and/or conferences did you attend during the 1980-81 school year? _____

7. Please list some of the workshop and/or conferences you have attended.

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

d. _____

e. _____

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

What were the strengths of the workshops? Please check:

Consultants'	☐	Director	☐
Materials and/or exercises	☐	Group participants	☐
Audiovisual materials (if any)	☐	Goals and Objectives	☐

Other ☐ (Please explain) _____

What were the weaknesses of the workshops? Please check:

Consultants	☐	Director	☐
Materials and/or exercises	☐	Group participants	☐
Audiovisual materials (if any)	☐	Goals and Objectives	☐

Other ☐ (Please explain) _____

Please note any suggestions for improving future workshops.
(Use other side if necessary.)